



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,571	07/30/2003	Athena Christodoulou	300201988-3	6465
22879	7590	05/21/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			NGUYEN, THUONG	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2155				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/21/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/629,571	CHRISTODOULOU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thuong (Tina) T. Nguyen	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 4/3/07. Claims 1, 11, 21, & 22 were amended. Claims 1-24 are pending and represent method and server system for establishment of network connections.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 11, 21 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Examiner could not find anywhere in the specification disclose the claim limitation such as "wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Regarding claim 10, the phrase "greatest" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claims 1, 11, 21 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It's unclear to the examiner how the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without the user input? After the user selected and actuate the link? If the method already displayed an alias for the address of the server then what is the purpose of "automatically displayed the alias by the browser without user input"? It's unclear how this is done and in what order and condition?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates Patent No. 6,751,777 B2 in view of Kolsky, Patent No. 2003/0028599 A1.

Bates teaches the invention as claimed including multi-target links for navigating between hypertext documents and the like (see abstract)

8. As to claim 1, Bates discloses that a method of providing a sub-page comprising the steps of:

sending to the client, with a copy of a first web page, a link which points to an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted (figure 6; col 5, lines 54-66; col 6, lines 15-50; col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of utilized multi-target links to navigate to the user which responses to input received from a user);

actuating the link (figure 4-6; col 9, lines 13-40; Bates discloses that the method of generating follow links in response to a user directing input to the display representation of a hypertext link); and

displaying, at the client by way of a browser, an alias for the address of the server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted at the client (figure 23; col 1, lines 54-60; col 9, lines 25-68; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of URL and bookmark which is the same as alias of the addresses);

But Bates failed to teach the claim limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input.

However, Kolsky teaches method and system for a communication scheme over heterogeneous networks (see abstract). Kolsky teaches the limitation wherein the alias

is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input (page 2, paragraph 11, 13-19; page 5, paragraph 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bates in view of Kolsky so that the system would be able to establish the method of displaying the alias and also connect that alias to the appropriate address by validating the alias. One would be motivated to do so to improve the cyclic redundancy check.

9. As to claim 2, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 1 wherein a plurality of links are provided, each pointing to a different address, and each different address being an address of a different server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted (col 7, lines 25 - col 8, lines, 60; col 13, lines 5-41; Bates discloses that the method of providing multi-target link of the bookmark list which provides the multiple navigational targets responsive to a given user input).

10. As to claim 3, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the alias is an address of a server which is adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted (col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of navigate to one or more of a plurality of available targets which identified by its storage location URL or filename, path and other manners of addressing a document).

11. As to claim 4, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the alias is displayed on a graphical user interface of a program running on the

client which is adapted to enable user navigation of the Internet, and wherein the alias corresponds to a first URL that is different from a second URL corresponding to the address of the server on which the cope sub-page is hosted (col 23, lines 1-20; Bates discloses that the method of displayed the pop-up menu, which connected with the link type and list of URL's that are displayed when the pointer is disposed over the display representation of the hyperlink).

12. As to claim 5, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 2 further comprising the steps of:

(a) determining, on the basis of a predetermined criterion, whether actuation of the link has been successful in obtaining the sub-page (figure 6 & 11; col 10, lines 1-24; Bates discloses that the method of based on the particular type of link activated by a user, the link type of a particular link may be determined from the user's setting to be display on the user representation);

(b) if not, actuating another of the links; and repeating steps (a) and (b) until the first to occur of: all of the links have been actuated; and actuation of a link has been successful in accordance with the predetermined criterion (figure 6 & 11; col 10, lines 48-50; col 11, lines 43-54; Bates discloses that the method of passing the block to determined whether additional URL's remain to be processed in the link if the document was not successfully retrieve).

13. As to claim 6, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 5 wherein the alias displayed is the same for each o f the links actuated (col 7, lines 25-

67; col 8, lines 61-67; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of targets for a particular bookmark such as URL and point to the same location).

14. As to claim 7, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 5 wherein the predetermined criterion is whether, within a predetermined period of time, a predetermined step in a process of establishing connection with a server has been reached (col 14, lines 8-15; Bates discloses that the method of updating the predetermined criteria to display the target links).

15. As to claim 8, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 7 wherein the predetermined step is completion of a connection with a server (col 6, lines 15-50; Bates discloses that the method of responding the user's input to display the activated links or retrieve documents from multiple location).

16. As to claim 9, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 2 further comprising the steps of:

actuating each of the links simultaneously (col 3, lines 21-30; Bates discloses that the method of displaying multi-target link based on user requested or activated the link);

on the basis of a predetermined criterion, selecting one of the actuated links, and terminating all of the others (figure 9; Bates discloses that the method of removing the links).

17. As to claim 10, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 9 wherein the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following

simultaneous actuation of all links (col 6, lines 15-50; Bates discloses that the method of established the connection with the server).

18. As to claim 11, Bates discloses that a method of operating a web server to provide a sub-page comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a client via a browser, a request for a first web page hosted on the server (col 3, lines 21-30; Bates discloses that the method of response to the user requested or when user activated the links);

sending to the client, with the first page, a link which points to an address within the Internet of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page (figure 6; col 5, lines 54-66; col 6, lines 15-50; col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of utilized multi-target links to navigate to the user which responses to input received from a user); and

sending with the first web page instructions which are executable upon actuation of the link to cause a browser pie program to display an alias of the address of the further server (figure 23; col 1, lines 54-60; col 9, lines 25-68; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of URL and bookmark which is the same as alias of the addresses),

wherein the alias of the address of the further server is different from the address of further server (col 7, lines 25 - col 8, lines, 60; col 13, lines 5-41; Bates discloses that the method of providing multi-target link of the bookmark list which provides the multiple navigational targets responsive to a given user input).

But Bates failed to teach the claim limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input.

However, Kolsky teaches the limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input (page 2, paragraph 11, 13-19; page 5, paragraph 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bates in view of Kolsky so that the system would be able to establish the method of displaying the alias and also connect that alias to the appropriate address by validating the alias. One would be motivated to do so to improve the cyclic redundancy check.

19. As to claim 12, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 11 wherein a plurality of links are sent to the client with the first page, each pointing to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page, and the instructions are executable upon actuation of each link (col 23, lines 1-20; Bates discloses that the method of displayed the pop-up menu, which connected with the link type and list of URL's that are displayed when the pointer is disposed over the display representation of the hyperlink).

20. As to claim 13, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 11, wherein the alias is an address of a server adapted to translate the alias to an address of one of the further servers (col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of

navigate to one or more of a plurality of available targets which identified by its storage location URL or filename, path and other manners of addressing a document).

21. As to claim 14, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 12 comprising the step of:

(a) determine on the basis of a predetermined criterion, whether actuation of the link has been successful in obtaining the sub-page (figure 6 & 11; col 10, lines 1-24; Bates discloses that the method of based on the particular type of link activated by a user, the link type of a particular link may be determined from the user's setting to be display on the user representation);

(b) if not, to actuate another of the links; and repeat steps (a) and (b) until the first to occur of: all of the links have been actuated; and actuation of a link has been successful in accordance with the predetermined criterion (figure 6 & 11; col 10, lines 48-50; col 11, lines 43-54; Bates discloses that the method of passing the block to determined whether additional URL's remain to be processed in the link if the document was not successfully retrieve).

22. As to claim 15, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 14 wherein the links are actuated in a predetermined order established prior to dispatch from the web server (figure 11; col 7, lines 25 - col 8, lines, 60; col 13, lines 5-41; Bates discloses that the method of providing multi-target link of the bookmark list which provides the multiple navigational targets responsive to a given user input).

23. As to claim 16, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 15 wherein the alias displayed is the same for each of the links actuated (col 7, lines 25-67;

col 8, lines 61-67; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of targets for a particular bookmark such as URL and point to the same location).

24. As to claim 17, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 15 wherein the predetermined criterion is whether, within a predetermined period of time, a predetermined step in a process of establishing connection with a further server has been reached (col 14, lines 8-15; Bates discloses that the method of updating the predetermined criteria to display the target links).

25. As to claim 18, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 17 wherein the predetermined step is completion of a connection with a further server (col 6, lines 15-50; Bates discloses that the method of responding the user's input to display the activated links or retrieve documents from multiple location).

26. As to claim 19, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 12 comprising the step of:

actuate each of the links simultaneously (col 3, lines 21-30; Bates discloses that the method of displaying multi-target link based on user requested or activated the link);  
select, on the basis of a predetermined criterion, one of the actuated links, and terminate all of the others (figure 9; Bates discloses that the method of removing the links).

27. As to claim 20, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 19 wherein the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the further servers after a specified interval of time following

simultaneous actuation of all links (col 6, lines 15-50; Bates discloses that the method of established the connection with the server).

28. As to claim 21, Bates discloses that a web server adapted to respond to a request from a client via a browser by:

sending to the client a copy of a first web page and to include with the first web page a plurality of links each of which points to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server (figure 6; col 5, lines 54-66; col 6, lines 15-50; col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the server of utilized multi-target links to navigate to the user which responses to input received from a user),

the web server being adapted to send with the first web page and in response to said request, instructions executable, upon actuation of one of the plurality of links, to instruct a browser program in the client to display an alias of the predetermined address, wherein the alias of each of the predetermined addresses is the same server (figure 23; col 1, lines 54-60; col 9, lines 25-68; Bates discloses that the server of displaying the list of URL and bookmark which is the same as alias of the addresses), and

wherein the alias is different from any of the predetermined addresses (col 7, lines 25 - col 8, lines, 60; col 13, lines 5-41; Bates discloses that the server of providing multi-target link of the bookmark list which provides the multiple navigational targets responsive to a given user input).

But Bates failed to teach the claim limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input.

However, Kolsky teaches the limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input (page 2, paragraph 11, 13-19; page 5, paragraph 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bates in view of Kolsky so that the system would be able to establish the method of displaying the alias and also connect that alias to the appropriate address by validating the alias. One would be motivated to do so to improve the cyclic redundancy check.

29. As to claim 22, Bates discloses that a method of obtaining a sub-page from a website comprising the steps of:

requesting from a web server a copy of a first web page (col 3, lines 21-30; Bates discloses that the method of response to the user requested or when user activated the links);

actuating a link on the first web page which points to an address within the Internet of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page (figure 4-6; col 9, lines 13-40; Bates discloses that the method of generating follow links in response to a user directing input to the display representation of a hypertext link); and

actuating code associated with the link to cause a browser program am to display an alias of the address of the further server, wherein the alias corresponds to a

first URL—that is different from a second URL corresponding to the address of the further server on which the copy of the sub page hosted (col 23, lines 1-20; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the pop-up menu, which connects with the link type and list of URL's that are displayed when the pointer is disposed over the display representation of the hyperlink).

But Bates failed to teach the claim limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input.

However, Kolsky teaches the limitation wherein the alias is an address of a web page which is to serve the client; and wherein the alias is automatically displayed by the browser without user input (page 2, paragraph 11, 13-19; page 5, paragraph 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bates in view of Kolsky so that the system would be able to establish the method of displaying the alias and also connect that alias to the appropriate address by validating the alias. One would be motivated to do so to improve the cyclic redundancy check.

30. As to claim 23, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the sending step comprises: displaying, based on a random selection, which of the plurality of links is to be actuated when the link on the first web page is selected by a user at the client (figure 23).

31. As to claim 24, Bates and Kolsky disclose that the method as recited in claim 23 comprising:

sending, to a second client, a copy of the first web page with a link which points to the address of another server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted (figure 6; col 5, lines 54-66; col 6, lines 15-50; col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of utilized multi-target links to navigate to the user which responses to input received from a user);

actuating the link sent to the second client (figure 4-6; col 9, lines 13-40; Bates discloses that the method of generating follow links in response to a user directing input to the display representation of a hypertext link); and

displaying, at the second client, a second alias for the address of the another server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted (figure 23; col 1, lines 54-60; col 9, lines 25-68; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of URL and bookmark which is the same as alias of the addresses),

wherein the second alias of the another server is the same as the alias of the server (col 7, lines 25-67; col 8, lines 61-67; Bates discloses that the method of displaying the list of targets for a particular bookmark such as URL and point to the same location), and

wherein the address of the another server is different from the address of the server (col 7, lines 25 - col 8, lines, 60; col 13, lines 5-41; Bates discloses that the method of providing multi-target link of the bookmark list which provides the multiple navigational targets responsive to a given user input).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection. In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that; A) Bates does not disclose an alias corresponding to an address of a server which adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted; B) Bates does not teach or suggest that once a document is retrieved from a first URL that has been actuated, subsequent URLs are not actuated; C) Bates does not teach or suggest determining whether a connection has been established with a server within a predetermined period of time; D) Bates does not teach the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following simultaneous actuation of all links; E) Bates does not teach or suggest plurality of links each pointing to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page; F) Bates does not teach or suggest an alias being an address of a server that is adapted to translate an address of one of further servers; G) Bates does not teach or suggest of random selection of links to be actuated when a link on a web page is selected by a user.

In response to A); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach an alias corresponding to an address of a server which adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach an alias corresponding to an address of a server which adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted (col 7, lines 25-35; Bates discloses that the method of navigate to one or more of a plurality of available targets which identified by its storage location URL or filename, path and other manners of addressing a document). Moreover, Bates discloses that the method of displaying the alias name for the particular link other than the address of the server. Therefore, Bates meets the claim limitation.

In response to B); In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., once a document is retrieved from a first URL that has been actuated, subsequent URLs are not actuated) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claimed only claimed to determined whether actuation of the link has been successful in obtaining the sub-page and if not, would actuating another of the links. Therefore, this argument is invalid.

In response to C); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach determining whether a connection has been established with a server within a predetermined period of time. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach determining whether a connection has been established with

a server within a predetermined period of time (figure 7 & 8; col 11, lines 60 – col 12, lines 55; Bates discloses that the method of updating the pre-determined criteria to display the target links). Moreover, Bates discloses that the method of recording the period of time which call ping time for various targets of the hypertext document being display and also set the predetermined amount of time for the time-out condition to redirect or display the selected link. Therefore, Bates meets the claim limitation.

In response to D); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following simultaneous actuation of all links. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following simultaneous actuation of all links (col 6, lines 15-50; Bates discloses that the method of established the connection with the server). Moreover, Bates discloses the method of established the connection with the server regardless whether it is the greatest process or not, because of the indefinite language of the claim. Therefore, Bates meets the claim limitation.

In response to E); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach plurality of links each pointing to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-

page. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach plurality of links each pointing to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page (col 3, lines 20-30; col 23, lines 1-20; Bates discloses that the method of displayed the pop-up menu, which connected with the link type and list of URL's that are displayed when the pointer is disposed over the display representation of the hyperlink). Moreover, Bates discloses that the method of activates a particular multi-target link and display the alias to the user other than the actual address to the server based on the criteria. Therefore, Bates meets the claim limitation.

In response to F); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach suggest an alias being an address of a server that is adapted to translate an address of one of further servers. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach suggest an alias being an address of a server that is adapted to translate an address of one of further servers (col 7, lines 25-60; Bates discloses that the method of navigate to one or more of a plurality of available targets which identified by its storage location URL or filename, path and other manners of addressing a document). Moreover, Bates discloses that the method of displaying an alias of the hypertext link other than the actual addresses of the server. Therefore, Bates meets the claim limitation.

In response to G); Applicants argue that Bates does not teach random selection of links to be actuated when a link on a web page is selected by a user. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Bates does teach random selection of links to be actuated when a link on a web page is selected by a user (figure 23; col 22, lines 10 – col 23, lines 40; Bates discloses that the method of actuated links once the user selected one of the links display on the browser either by enter the link or by select the drop down button). Therefore, Bates discloses the claim invention such as actuated links on a web page when the user selected the particular links.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuong (Tina) Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3864, and the fax number is 571-273-3864. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thuong (Tina) Nguyen  
Patent Examiner/Art Unit 2155



SALEH NAJJAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER